

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on February 5, 2008 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Present Status of Application

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 14-20 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa et al (US 5,600,203, hereinafter "Namikawa") in view of Ellison et al (US 20020079611, hereinafter "Ellison"). Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa in view of Ellison and in further view of Yakou et al (US 5,855,637, hereinafter "Yakou"). Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa in view of Ellison and in further view of Guenther et al (US 6,949,880, hereinafter "Guenther").

In this paper, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 14-20 and 23-24 are canceled. Claims 25 and 27-29 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namikawa in view of Ellison and in further view of Guenther. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as follow.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Claim 25 recites a method of repositioning display spacers using inductive attraction, comprising:

providing spacers made of electrostatic materials;

providing an inductive chuck to attract the spacers by electrostatic force, wherein a voltage is applied to the inductive chuck and the spacers are lifted by the inductive chuck, wherein the spacers directly contact the inductive chuck, ***wherein the electrostatic force lifts the spacers and brings them into contact with the inductive chuck***;

providing a substrate;

aligning the spacers with desired positions on the substrate; and

interrupting the voltage applied to the inductive chuck, wherein the spacers directly contact the substrate.

In the rejections, the Examiner alleges that Namikawa teaches a method of repositioning spacers using an inductive chuck. The Examiner acknowledges that Namikawa does not disclose the use of an electrostatic force to reposition spacers. The Examiner instead relies on Guenther to teach this feature.

As the Examiner himself states in the Office action, Guenther teaches “the use of electrostatic force to hold spacers in order to prevent spacer agglomeration on the substrate.” See page 6 of the Office action. However, Guenther fails to teach or suggest repositioning a spacer by electrostatic force. Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion in the cited art to replace the magnetic force of Namikawa with electrostatic force.

In particular, the combination/modification of Namikawa in view of Guenther would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to 1) relocate a spacer by magnetic force and 2) hold spacers by electrostatic force in order to prevent spacer agglomeration on a substrate. There is no suggestion or motivation to reposition a spacer by electrostatic force (as recited in claim 25: providing an inductive chuck to attract the spacers by electrostatic force, wherein the electrostatic force lifts the spacers and brings them into contact with the inductive chuck, aligning the spacers with desired positions on the substrate; and interrupting the voltage applied to the inductive chuck, wherein the spacers directly contact the substrate). Moreover, there is no teaching in Namikawa, Ellison or Guenther regarding how to reposition a spacer by

electrostatic force.

It is therefore Applicant's belief that even when taken in combination, the prior art references relied upon by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 25. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established in connection with these claims. Furthermore, as it is Applicant's belief that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established for claim 25, the Examiner's arguments in regard to the dependent claims are not addressed here. Allowance of claims 25 and 27-29 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **502447**.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nelson A. Quintero/

Nelson A. Quintero

Reg. No. 52,143

Customer No. 34,283

Telephone: (310) 909-8535

P130868NAQ